

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 7 and 12 are pending, with Claims 1, 2, 6, and 12 being independent.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 12 have been amended. The Official Action asked that Applicant provide support for the amendments. In response, Applicant respectfully wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to, e.g., pp. 62 and 66-69, and Figs. 41 and 42, among other places. Of course, the claims are not limited to the disclosed embodiments.

Claims 1, 2, and 5 were objected to for informalities. All objections are respectfully traversed, and are submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of the claims in a manner earnestly believed to avoid the grounds of objection, viz, the claims have been amended as kindly suggested in the Official Action.

Claims 1 through 7 and 12 again were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over US 2003/0182503 A1 (Leong, et al.) in view of US 6,820,187 B2 (Asano, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 6, and 12 variously recite, *inter alia*, transmitting, to the second device, of another command block which designates (a) processing to be performed with the updated first data buffer *and* (b) processing to be performed with the second data buffer which is not updated, even if the data communication for the second data buffer has not been completed (with updating in accordance with the notification or completion message).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Leong, et al. nor Asano, et al., even in the proposed combination, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, discloses or

suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1, 2, 6, and 12.

Applicant respectfully submits that Leong, et al. shows, e.g., that a storage system controls a disk in a disk array, wherein the I/O task 320 is suspended until its child I/O task is complete (see, e.g., [0065]-[0066]) — as a result if there is any child I/O which does not complete writing data, it is impossible, submits Applicant, to perform the next writing processing in Leong, et al. At p. 4, the Official Action states “note that the first and second data buffers may be accessed by two I/O tasks which do not have corresponding child I/O tasks and thus will not be suspended in order to wait for any child tasks to complete (Leong Fig. 4-5, paragraph 94).” Applicant respectfully traverses the foregoing. Applicant wishes to point out that such cannot provide either a description or a suggestion of the above-discussed claimed features which require, *inter alia*, that the command block also designates processing to be performed with the second data buffer which is not updated — the “two I/O tasks” alleged by the Official Action would not constitute the claimed feature.

Applicant respectfully submits that Asano, et al. discloses, e.g., that the DMA controller issues a command completion notice together with the VTID corresponding to the performed command (e.g., col. 10, lines 20-30) — but Applicant submits that the master processor issues the next command without waiting for a response to a previously-transmitted command; accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Asano, et al. cannot be read to remedy Leong, et al.’s deficiencies given that the claims require, *inter alia*, updating *in accordance with* the notification or completion message.

Applicant also respectfully traverses the taking of Official Notice.

Applicant further respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features. By means of such features, Applicant respectfully submits that it is possible to perform another processing using the first data buffer even if the data communication for the second data buffer has not been completed, and that it is possible to improve the efficiency of processing.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/jjr

FCHS_WS 3613673v1